

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are now pending in the application. Claims 3, 7, 10, and 11 are now cancelled. Claim 1 is now amended. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,017,259) in combination with Banno et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,761,925). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 7, 10, and 11 are now cancelled. Therefore, the Section 103 rejections of these cancelled claims are now moot.


Amended independent Claim 1 recites, in part and with reference to Figures 2, 3, and 4 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, "sequentially arranging a plurality of droplets in the plurality of defined pattern forming areas (R1, R2, and R3) to form the film patterns" and "wherein the droplets are arranged essentially simultaneously in the plurality of pattern forming areas to form at least two of the film patterns essentially simultaneously." For example and as set forth at paragraph [0066] and Figure 2A of the application as filed, "in order to form the first side pattern Wa in each of the first, second and third pattern forming areas R1, R2, R3, the droplets discharged from the first, second and third discharge nozzles 10A, 10B, 10C are simultaneously arranged every two pixels of first side pattern forming areas" (emphasis added).

The Banno et al. reference appears to disclose forming one film 4 at a time. Similarly, the Motoi et al. reference appears to disclose forming one film 4 at a time. The Banno et al. and the Motoi et al. references each fail to disclose or suggest "wherein the droplets are arranged essentially simultaneously in the plurality of pattern forming areas to form at least two of the film patterns essentially simultaneously," as set forth in amended Claim 1. Therefore, combination of the Banno et al. and the Motoi et al. references fails to render obvious amended Claim 1 and those claims dependent therefrom. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Dated: *Sept. 17, 2007*

Respectfully submitted,
By: 
Gregory Schivley,
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303, (248) 641-1600